DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 742 CG 006 035

AUTHOR King, Paul T.
TITLE Paleolithic Counseling - The Good Old Days.
INSTITUTION Missouri Univ., Columbia.
PUB DATE 7 Oct 70
NOTE 19p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.05
DESCRIPTORS Counseling, *Counseling Effectiveness, *Counseling Theories, Counselor Client Ratio, *Individual Characteristics, Interpersonal Relationship, Social Adjustment, *Social Change, Social Characteristics, *Social Factors, Values

ABSTRACT

This paper outlines what clients were like in the "Good Ol' Days", as compared with what they are like now. Formerly clients appeared to come in with a plethora of ego energy, while now it seems more like a depletion. Explicit in our culture now is the idea that it is almost healthy and good to publicize one's private experience. Some of counselors' "tried and true" counseling methods of the past are less than overwhelmingly successful with clients who hold these values, and who bring in such value derivation problems. Thus a fundamental change in techniques may be called for. New forces have appeared such as the problems of population explosion and a time limited planet. If counseling psychology is to continue to remain viable and relevant more segments of the profession should become involved in problems that are usurping the minds of the lay public at the present time. One immediate change would be to have psychological service centers and counseling psychologists rescue the ear of university faculty and administrators from the confusions which surround it. (Author/KJ)

ED 044742

PALEOLITHIC COUNSELING - THE GOOD OLD DAYS

Presented by: Dr. Paul T. King

25th Anniversary Share-in
October 7, 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

I can't tell you how pleased I am to be asked to talk to you at this Counseling Share-in. It means something very special to me to be asked back to the place where I and many others like me, professionally and emotionnally grew up. It provides a most welcome validation of my affection for my old friends here, and of my fondness for this University and locality. To me, there is no dearer spot than Michigan State University, and East Lansing. My family and I loved it here, and we always look forward to the opportunity to return.

As some of you know, I have been on sabbatical leave in Guadalajara for the past six months--what a place, and what a climate--if you are thinking about retiring soon; there's the place to do it, but that's a whole different tack, and probably inappropriate for this Share-in. I have the feeling, after doing some reading on imprinting and the effects of primacy of experience, that the experiences people have during the early years of their professional development are the most indelible ones, and that they maintain an ascendency in guiding the careers of such people for many years thereafter. I am sure that, in some ways, I imprinted on the fine people who were at Michigan State when I was here years ago. People like Lee Erlandson, Don Grummon, Bill Kell, Gwen Norrell, Dorothy Ross, Tom Goodrich, Rowland Pierson, Bea Moore, Ross Matteson, and others. These people imbued me with a sense of personal and professional identity that hasn't failed me to this day. And I'm so happy to be able to say Thanks, and really mean it.

I am particularly sensitized to humor these days, partially, I suspect, because there is so little of it on college campuses at the present time. But I recall many funny things that occurred back in those early days when the Michigan State Counseling Center was getting under way. You'll remember my title--I am supposed to be talking about the past, you know, and those of you that know me well realize that I have some genetic predilections in that direction.

CG 006 035

Well, anyway, one day Bob Smith, a former counselor here, and I were slated for veterans' counseling, something we did a lot of during the early and mid-50's. We had had our initial interview with our clients and had assigned vocational tests, which Dr. Norrell and her contingent of psychometrists always administered for us. This was when we were in the old Basic College building just west of this building. Suddenly a jack-hammer operator started working just outside our window, and it severely startled me. I said, "what's that?" and Bob, without even a thought pause, said, "That's my veteran taking the Minnesota Rate of Mannipulation Test, and I'm going to set him up to be a brain surgeon." I laughed, Bob laughed, everybody laughed, and it was a good feeling. There was a lot of laughter then, and, although we all had our problems, we did not seem so deadly serious about the business of living. I am referring now to the grimness we are sensing on our campuses nowadays, and the unmistakable lack of humor in the nation at large. Addressing himself to the dearth of national humor, Melvin Maddox, writing in Time Magazine about a month ago said, "Who needs laughs when everybody is doing his Thing? Like a patient who has just finished analysis the emancipated American is inclined to regard his lack of humor as evidence of strength. To him, laughs are just wiggles in the corset of the up-tight." To me this is a dolorous state of affairs.

You'll be pleased to hear that I have omitted two or three points from my initial outline, thus shortening my speech. I am not going to talk about the early development of counseling psychology, or attempt to account for the recent popularity and acceptance of our profession. What I shall try to do is to give a brief perspective on some gradually changing emphases in counseling psychology, outline some of the cultural and sociological correlates of such changes, and to adumbrate, without infringing on the rights of the subsequent speakers, some possible directions for us in the future.

Most of us in the room who are over 40 would probably have to admit we are not as comfortable in doing counseling or psychotherapy as we were 15-20 years back. For one thing we probably don't

cognitively process information as quickly and easily as we once did. But in addition to this, there was a definite security in being a counselor then, especially in a university counseling center. The role of both the counselor and the client were fairly well defined. Both knew within reasonable limits how they were to behave, and most of the time the relationship moved along comfortably within these confines. Oh, occasionally people would get out of line, but in general clients knew what was expected of them, and they appeared to be content with this role.

The therapeutic focus was definitely on things which were happening inside the skin. Emotionality and affect in the client were sought fervently, his phantasies were important, and the symbolism in his dreams, and everyday life were grist for the therapeutic mill. His repetitive, cicadic patterns of behavior were looked for, because we felt these were clues to "deeper life themes" of which he was unaware, (some of us said unconscious) and which must be brought under ego control. Words like Dynamic formulations, ego, syntonic, repression, Oedipal anxiety, separation panic, superego lacunae, phenomenal field, etc., were rampant in our professsional vocabulary. Intervening variables? Maybe--but when we used them, we felt like we knew what they meant.

Therapy had a mystical, "artsy", flavor to it, in spite of the fact that men like Rogers, Crummon, Kell, Snyder, and others were doing some important, seminal research in this area, and trying hard to be objective about everything. I think our feeling for the "art" involved in doing counseling was reflected in our belief that this ability was inborn, and could only be developed in persons who already had this native endowment. It just wasn't a thing that could be taught anybody like equitation, or driving an automobile. Personality most assuredly had a quintessence to it, we thought there was a "core" to a person's being, an average way of behaving that was relatively stable from day to day. To us, as Allport puts it well, an individual was more than a composite of the various ways he was seen by his colleagues, or the behavioral result of stimulus elicitations in his environment.

In the socio-cultural realm, there was a different fabric of psychological and religious thought. God definitely was not dead for most of us, nor, did we consider him to be "alive and well and living in Venezuela." Man's soul still held sway in religous circles. It was something he possessed that had a thing-like quality to it, and, although few people actually thought it had a physical representation, if they were asked to point to where it would be if they actually had one, they would point to some place in the middle thoracic region.

There were two things then that made it appear locical for us to look inside the individual's skin for the most important happenings. One, the fact that most religions emphasized a soul inside the body, and felt it needed looking out after; and two, the percept held by most psychologists that personality was an internal sort of thing--with much less of a tendency for it to be seen as an aggregate of discrete behaviors pulled from the person by environmental contingencies. Looking inward seemed like the obvious place to look for what was important in a person's life and, believing as we did that a person's behavior just ordinarily emanated from his affective and cognitive organization, we attempted straight-away to get at the roots of his problems.

Aside: Nevitt Sanford pointed out in a speech at the University of California at Berkeley the mutual decline of concern for man's soul in religion and a diminution of interest in personality theory and reconstructive psychotherapy in psychology.

The clients we saw back then were spawned, of course, by the culture of the early 40's and 50's. Psychopathy wasn't totally out of style in those days, but it wasn't as visible then as it is now. We did have a bumper crop of clients who might be described as having a plethora of ego energy, and who didn't know what to do with it. When this excessive energy discharge was stabilized by the formation of symptons, we had clients who complained of

anxiousness, inability to sleep, inability to get their mind off arrantly inconsequential matters, bodily malfunctions, or just simply having a lot of "abnormal" days. For the most part, we interpreted these types of malaise as stemming from blocked instinctual impulses, and I think we were probably correct. These were much more inhibited times, the times in which these clients grew up, and the clients who finally wended their way into the counselor's office were inhibited clients. And I can say in all modesty: we did a good job with them.

Our subjectively validated techniques for dealing with such clients had been honed down to a fairly fine edge, and, if we weren't doing a lot of research on psychotherapy in those days, we were so indentified with the professional model of an applied psychologist that we did conscientiously and systematically observe what effects our techniques were subsequently having on our clients.

And we did a lot of talking too, among ourselves, our colleagues. There was a lot of cross-pollination. If somebody would discover something useful therapeutically, they'd pass it around. Joe Reyher taught us how to get at primary process material by Free Imagery Techniques: Bill Kell explored the use of modeling clay with non-talkative clients: Josephine Morse, Kell and others experimented with multiple counseling as a means of reconstructing the anaclitic family constellation. Somebody thought of the idea of darkening the rooms during the early stages of therapy as a means of reducing secondary process in the client, and having the room well lighted during latter stages when ego synthesis and integration was called for. It was sort of nice, I'll admit, not to be responsible for knowing definitely whether these things actually worked or not. Empirically they seemed to, and we whole-heartedly believed, that if you really cared for and respected your client, a few well-meaning mistakes along the way would cancel out. We could possibly be accused of loving well, but not too wisely.

During those days our concern was on the whole person in psychology--his hopes, dreams, fears, ambitions, etc., and, to that extent, we were well nestled in the corpus of traditional psychotherapy. Even Freud, with his tri-portite system of personality, and in spite of the ridicule his anthropomorhpism of the id, ego, and super-ego had received, had not induced serious-minded psychotherapists to disassemble the human being in order to pay restrictive attention to various malfunctioning parts. Of course we had people with stuttering problems, problems of impotence, phobias about a multiplicity of things, but these apparently circumscribed problems did not make us un-mindful that it was a whole person, uniquely arranged, who had the problem.

But, looking back on what it seems like we believed then, I detected a deep respect for the power of cognition, for the full use of one's intelligence, for the re-engagement of purpose in one's life and, along with a pinch of willed optimism in the client these would be the things that dislodged the individual's neurosis and restored him to a satisfying life again. I realize that sounds like the "power of positive thinking" under a new guise, but it is not, I think.

I suspect that most psychotherapists 15 or 20 years ago were wed to the notion that the elicitation of the client's affect was totally necessary if one was to effect any permanent change in restructuring the personality. We sought affect then with the same tenacity that a hound runs a hot line, and, in fact, one of the oft-used expressions was "tracking the client", meaning staying close to his feelings and pulling on him for affect.

The Snyder group at Penn State, of which I was a part, scored transcripts of client interviews in those days, and we had a category called Clarification of Feeling, which was much to be desired as a proper therapeutic comment. I recall that any transcript which had less than 70-75% clarifications, out of the total possible comments by the counselor, was just not "up to snuff." So we all tried hard for affect.

A correlate idea was that any excessive use of the client's brain during the early stages of the therapy process was detensive intellectualization, and many clients did express the feeling that their mind seemed like an enemy, that is, appeared to be against them rather than for them. Whether we subtly taught our clients to "feel first think later" much in the same manner that the experimental subjects of Hefferline learned unconsiously to twitch their thumbs to turn off aversive sound, I don't know.

The implicit cognito-affective model we were using was that chronically repressed feeling interfered with intellectual processes, via the ego defense mechanisms, or some similar personality construct, and that the discharge of this affect enabled the individual to employ his intelligence in more discriminative and penetrating ways; hence to use his intelligence to adjust.

The point I was originally trying to make was that the ultimate aim in therapy was to enable the individual to use his cognitive potency, his discriminative capacity to help him pick his way through a thorny life-world. Of course, the client needed to know how to express feeling continuously as part and parcel of everyday living for several reasons: we thought it was necessary in order to feel alive and vital on a moment-to-moment basis, it's what gave life its zest and meaning, and we thought it was also necessary if one was to avoid the situation of the original problem duplicating itself, the maladjustment reforming.

Anthropologists tell us that possibly the two greatest breakthroughs in the evolution of man have been the double circulation of the blood through the heart, which enabled the extra-order ancestors of man to free themselves from their marshy habitat, and to make more extended forays on dry land making use of ambient atmosphere. The other breakthrough was the development of the crebral cortex in the higher primates, and especially in man, which enabled the latter to use tools, to symbolize his present experience, to codify his past, and to program his future.

It seems to me that any intervention in the affairs of an individual as in psychotherapy, or mankind collectively, as in national politics, will ultimately have to deal with man as a non-fractionated, organizing, and integrating organism, whose awareness and knowingness are the mainstays in his avoidance of subjugation-subjugation to his own neuroticism, or subjugation by persons or people, who for one reason or another, desire to rule other human beings.

To be fully human is to be fully whole, and, as I see it, efforts which are based on the essential fractionation of human beings, whether in education, psychology, medicine, or what not are attenuated to the extent that they adhere to this concept. Perhaps I am a little "hipped" on the subject of fractionation, but it seems to that our people-world is moving in the direction of increased disjointedness rather than more integration. I am reminded of our fractionated teaching methods in which college students cannot see the relevance of their subject matter to the business of living. Or at some of our new psychotherapies which extirpate a bit of a person's behavior without providing him with the grasp of where such infarcted self-driven behavior fits into the fabric of his total life and organized experience.

A few minutes ago I outlined what clients were like in the "Good Ol' Days", the title of this little talk. Now, let me tell you what clients are like today, as my colleagues and I at Missouri are perceiving them. You'll recall that I mentioned former clients appeared to come in with a plethora of ego energy, resulting from strangulated affect and impounded impulses.

It's a different picture now. Rather than a plethora of ego energy from which our clients suffer, it seems more like a depletion. More frequently students come to the Counseling Centers with a different constellation of complaints. Nowadays, we are more likely to encounter clients who complain of being aimless,

hollow inside, no sense of direction, unable to commit to their work or goals, a pointlessness in life, and other similar things that imply their "generators" have run down. Often they will be preoccupied with a feeling of nothingness, or of the dissolution of their ego or self. Ostow puts it clearly when he says, "Perhaps the most distressing feature of the state of depleted ego energy is the sense of inner pain which it creates. This pain colors all psychic activity in the state of depletion so that all experience becomes painful, all anticipations are pessimistic, all narcissism becomes hypochondria, and death sometimes seems preferable to life."

Not all clients coming in complain of these types of problems, but we encounter them more often than we used to. The client who comes to the Counseling Center under the influence of LSD or some other drug is not a complete rarity these days, or one that shows up for an appointment "stewed to the gills". We had a girl like this several months ago.

Explicit in our culture now, I think, is the idea that it is always healthy and good to publicize one's private experience. In fact, it is a sign of weakness if one "holds back", or shows a twinge of inhibition. The increasing use of LSD and marjuana, begging the question of whether we should be able to use these drugs with impunity, has influenced many people to believe that the externalization of one's psyche is unequivocally desirable and has no deleterious sequelae. Sublimation is a much less used defense in our culture today. Actually, it seems like we don't really need it, with everybody letting it "all hang out" and committed to doing their thing.

I am attempting to make the point that a considerable change is occurring in our national psyche--that is, to act out, to externalize, to express, to not hold back, are good things.

Some of our tried and true counseling methods of the past are less than overwhelmingly successful with clients who hold these values, and who bring such value derivative problems to us for help. And, obviously, clients who hold such values don't as often turn to us for help. In this same vein we just finished a study at Missouri that indicated a large percentage of students who, if they had a personal problem, would feel that a friend would be a much more appropriate person to talk to than a counselor.

I think my remarks, or maybe my tone, have implied that such directional changes are "bad" and should be reversed. I'm not sure I think that. Naturally values, psyches, concepts as to what is health engendering and what isn't, have to evolve just like everything else. It is those times when we are in transition from one consolidated constellation of mores to another that are the most "nervous" for everybody. The fact that we are in a process of change, and that a large segment of our young adult population is making strenuous efforts to think and act differently, implies that something is wrong with our values and the "system". We don't need to pile up any more evidence in that direction. We know about the riots, the demonstrations, the marches, the besieging of the bastions of authority and tradition, the precarious perch of college presidents and educators. Who knows what lies on the other side of these movements, what sort of person-psychology we'll have? Hopefully, something much better than we have now.

Changing times will put pressure on us as psychologists to behave differently, and many of you are doing that already. There is much less of a total adherence to the old therapeutic model of remaining in one's office until sought out by the client with a problem. Many of you are making forays out into the dorms, residence halls, departmental offices, etc., and practicing newly acquired skills of your profession.

But even more fundamental change may be called for. With increasing externalization of individual experience, more confrontation in interpersonal relations, and just the increase in sheer numbers of people on the globe, perhaps people are going to need more direct help in evaluating their own experiences and the behaviors of others. General semanticists tell us that this is one of the most serious deficiencies in the mental health armamentarium of human beings--that of not knowing how to evaluate what has happened to them, or how to evaluate the noises made by other people about them.

Perhaps mental health classes in kindergarten and the elemntary grades, teaching young children how to evaluate their experiences in the home and school, and conscious effort applied to teaching them how to integrate what they know and what they feel are needed. Maybe in these days of geometrically expanding complexity in living, we can't rely on our old cognitive and language structures to produce optimally adjusted human beings.

In this vein, the geneticist, Ginsburg, has come up with a frightening but interesting notion. He says perhaps we are all evolving toward a controlled schizophrenia, which will ultimately help us deal with this world's complexity. Right now schizophrenia is seen as deviant and inefficient, because it has not evolved far enough nor has it been sufficiently buffered by certain types of gene action, to result in its becoming a consolidated and effective adjustment.

The contemporary literature and news media are replete with portents that have the capacity to make us very afraid. We have the breed of doomsday sociologists who are saying outright at us that the amount of living space a human being can expect to call his own will shrink to unthinkable limits within the next several hundred years, that the body heat of human beings, if population increases are realized, will be enough to raise the temperature of the earth to uncomfortable heights.

They are also introducing the concept of a time limited planet; an earth which is having its resources squandered at its present rate, won't last forever. Some even say the end is in sight. These are understandably the sorts of things that make men of any age, but especially young adults and teenagers, especially fearful about what the future holds for them. They obviously don't want to inherit a burned-out planet. In talking to the young people, however, it seems it is not the actual threat of nuclear holocaust, or the concept of a time-limited planet, or the unreasoning exploitation of our natural resources that is so enraging to them, but the quality of our national response to these problems.

I am presently engaged, along with John Powell here at Michigan State, on a research project that is investigating the contemporary value system of college students. One of the things we did early in the investigation was to give an open-ended questionnaire, asking such questions as: What do you like most about yourself? How would you like to see America changed? A large number of answers (I don't know the percentage) accused politicians, rule makers, government officials, etc., of connivance, meaning really pretending not to see some of the serious threats to our security and welfare, and pretending they do not really exist. Senator McGovern of North Dakota has recently said that it is this fatuousness in our quality of response to such problems, rather than the threat per se of such problems, that accounts for the rebelliousness and revolution-mindedness of people under 30. We preach love and consideration for our fellow man, but we manage to keep an inhuman war going for years with no signs of abatement, we go to the moon but are not solving our city traffic jams, we anticipate spending 25 billion dollars on a highly doubtful missle-system when the quality of some of our educational programs in impoverished school systems is seen as woefully inadequate, and so on.

Where does counseling psychology fit into all of this? What contribution may we make as psychologists to help lessen the bifurcation of values that confronts sensitive minded people in our nation today--that is, knowing what needs to be done, but somehow remaining ineffectual in doing anything about it.

I talk to many psychologists who feel we do have some of the skills and knowledge that would be serviceable to persons in authority who are forced to make crucial decisions regarding such problems. However, most of these psychologists say they feel guilty about their temerity in thinking that they could actually make a contribution on such crucial matters. It seems to me, if counseling psychology is to continue to remain viable and relevant more segments of our profession should become involved in problems that are usurping the minds of the lay public at the present time.

This does not negate the continuing need for personal and individual psychotherapy, as I think there will always be a need for that special type of intervention, and some of us have a stronger affinity for that type of constructive action than for any other. But I think it is especially important for psychological service centers, counseling centers, etc., to attempt to alleviate a wider spectrum of human life.

In some sense, we don't have to go to where the action is, as nowadays the action is coming to us. The problems of the campuses are becoming increasingly indistinguishable from those of the nation at large. We now have riots, coup de etats, demonstrations, boycotts, peace movements, fomenting speeches by political activists -- all this on college campuses. So we actually don't have to go anywhere else to ply our trade. Sociological happenstance has provided us with our own crucible in which to mix our medicine.

If I could make my own world, there are two or three things that I would change immediately, after taking care of some of my more personal concerns. At the top of the list would be to have psychological service centers and counseling psychologists rescue the ear of university faculty and administrators from the confusions which surround it. I think a lot of administrators see us as repositories where they can dump people that are "getting in their hair", and who also think that although we probably won't do anybody any good, we probably won't harm them either. On a semantic differential, counseling centers would perhaps be characterized as well-meaning and innocuous, especially by the faculty. I talk to faculty members very often who honestly don't know where the Counseling Center is located, or who feel our exclusive domain is with vocational testing.

It seems especially, at this time, when human feelings and emotions are so much in the focus of things, that counseling centers and experts in human relations have so much to offer. And I say this in all modesty. As many other counseling centers are now doing, we at the University of Missouri are making efforts in many directions. We are experimenting with racial confrontation groups, have conducted psychomats for people who wish to come in and talk in groups about anything that's on their mind, and we are hoping to move into the academic area, assisting teachers, if they wish, in relating better to their classes, or helping them with some particular problem related to their lecturing or classroom manner.

At first blush, this might seem presumptious of us, but we don't feel that way about it. We honestly feel we can be of service in these areas, we do think seriously about such problems, and we consider that our efforts at constructive action are better than allowing such problems to run their course. I referred several minutes ago to capturing the ear of the administration. So also I should like to have faculty consider us as relevant interveners into matters such as I have outlined. We could be useful.

In the past, when we have embarked on such enterprises, it was often with the feeling that we were intruders and were stepping out of bounds.

In the few minutes that I have left, I should like to talk about some of the problems that I see lying unresolved in psychology, at large, which have plagued us for a long number of years. I should also like to mention some trends with I feel psychology has taken which are leading us into unproductive areas. Let me talk stiffily about history for a moment.

From Freud we have inherited a psycholgy of conflict. In this type of psychology dynamic forces are ordinarily opposed by other forces in a locked-horns position, within a closed physical system analogous to a gasoline engine, or a hydraulic pump. Freud's psychology, of course, was hatched in the Victorian era of Europe's history, when strong morals and prohibitions against instinctual expression were the custom.

Freud was strongly influenced by the German physiologists who, at the time, were rigidly adhering to a scientific materialism, or logical positivism, as it was later to be called. Reductionism was the order of the day; things had to be reduced to basic elements in order to reduce uncertainty to the lowest degree possible, and to be scientifically pure.

The physics of that day, considered the father of all sciences, was enamored of the investigation of basic matter, from which all things could ultimately be made, depending upon how the molecules and atoms were arranged. Physical matter, and the locatability of such matter, were the key concepts on which science was based. This thinking was mainly the influence of the Cartesian revolution which

held that all phenomena, including mental, could be explained by physio-chemical processes, that matter can be reduced to discrete and analyzable elements, and that the basic elements of nature are homegenous in character.

When human beings came to be placed firmly in the realm of physical matter, it followed that they should obey the same laws that governed inorganic matter, and were subject to the same sorts of interpretations. That sort of thinking urged us to adopt a completely deterministic view of human nature, an antihumanistic view some people say, and relegated free will to the realm of the never-to-be-understood. This implied that the concept of self-determination was not needed if our knowledge and predictability of human behavior were extensive enough.

This was the model on which psychology founded itself. It has essentially shaped our thinking to the present day. We have psychologists whose motivation to adhere to the rules of what constitutes a proper science has shaped what they purport to investigate, and seriously constricted their range of curiosity and creativity. We have psychologists who, in the area of psychotherapy, have delimited their total research effort in an atavistic adherence to the Cartesian tradition of what is materialistic and locatable.

If physics has been our guide, then physics is changing, and if we are continuing to model after the physical sciences, then we have some basic alternations in our thinking to make. Physics is now saying that what constitutes locatability of an atomic particle is far from being resolved. The basic tenets of the science model on which psychology so rigidly patterned itself is beginning to change. Perhaps we need to look around for a new model, or if we keep the old one, we need to evolve a looser and less constrictive one than we now have.

It seems to me that any apriori method determining how problems shall be investigated, or limiting the manner of approach to experiments, or unduly restricting ourselves to pure laboratory methods and technology is unscientific, if one means by science, attempting to abstract certain chunks of the world's dependable knowledge.

I have been doing a lot of reading lately on cognitive development, and I recall that the structure of cognition has a great deal to do with what facts are perceived in the first place, and how those facts are related in the second. I am suggesting that now, we need to explore a new cognitive structure in relation to the way we think about people, a structure that will put more emphasis on purpose, freedom of choice, cooperative human interaction, and optimism? Perhaps we should center less on the conflicts inherent in a situation, and also less on the immutability of opposing forces and more on synthesis and integration.

We have psychologists at the University of Missouri, as you probably do here also, who are proud of their lack of knowledge and uninterest in personality theory or psychotherapy because it is messy--it deals with so many imponderables, or has so many variables that are difficult to measure, making experimental neatness hard to attain.

I think we have to be on guard in psychology not to investigate elegantly the inconsequential. In the reading of most of our professional journals nowadays, one gets the impression that most of the research was conducted because the data could be fitted into some neat paradigm, or that the experimenter was more enchanted with the method of his investigation than he was motivated to reveal a substantial bit of new knowledge of the science of psycholgy. In speaking of research of this kind, maybe what psychology needs is less research rather than more of it.

I should also like to see more status accorded the research that is descriptive in nature. Careful observation can be a powerful weapon in the hands of a skilled psychologist. Look at the book by Kell & Moellor. Some of the greatest contributions to knowledge have been made by men like Darwin and Freud whose main approach was that of sensitive observation, as contrasted with the employment of immaculate laboratory procedures. I am suggesting here that our need to hurry into the laboratory with a problem that is researchable by our present scientific standards is getting in the way with our ability to think wholly and uninhibitedly about problems of a larger scope and of a more basic concern.

Perhaps we have been guilty of accepting an abstract, a partial truth, as the whole truth where scientific matters are concerned, and are attempting to fit all human data into scientific models that were originally made for the physical sciences. I am sure, for certain types of human experimentation, such procedures are more than adequate, but I am recommending that we do not allow our adherence to the rigorous methods of pure science to close off from investigation many areas of human interest and consequence.

It seems to me that my graduate students are continually passing over fascinating problems they could be investigating. They are afraid to investigate them because the problems can't be made neat enough, or defendable enough, to pass the critical eye of their committee members. This attitude eventuates in their researching problems that they themselves are not enthusiastic about, nor are their committee members. I think something like this is also going on on a national scale. I am suggesting that we broaden our concept of what constitutes "good" scientific methods.

I have obviously rambled some in this talk with you this morning, but I have had some unrelated things I have wished to discuss. I have been in the fortunate position of being allowed to talk about the past, a topic which I knew something about. I have been spared the strenuous thinking required to collate an enormous amount of information about the present and make rememberable predictions and prognostications about the future.

I have thoroughly enjoyed having this opportunity this morning, and I shall be talking personally with many of you later. Thank you.